## LOSS DUE TO LEASE OF MUNICIPAL LODGING ROOMS IN MUNICIPAL BUS STAND, HAMPANAKATTA, MANGALORE.

373. SRI B. BHASKAR SHETTY (Kaup):—

Will the Minister of State for Municipal Administration be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether the Divisional Commissioner, Mysore, has granted permission for the continuance of the lease of the Municipal, Lodging rooms in the Municipal Bus Stand, Lampanakatta, Mangalore on 15th February 1969 for a further period of five years, with effect from 1st April 1969 on the existing lease amount of Rs. 13,900 per annum in in favour of the present lessee on the recommendation of the Municipal Commissioner of Mangalore City Municipality;

(*b*) whether the Divisional Commissioner accorded such permission under the provisions of the Mysore Municipalites Act, 1964 as amended and Rules framed thereunder, without consulting the Municiipal Council and without their assent in the matter;

(c) the special provisions of law under which the Divisional Commissioner has issued such orders without obtaining prior assent of the Municipal Council;

(*d*) whether the Municipal President of Mangalore Municipality has represented to the concerned Minister and submitted a memorandum on 7th April 1969, apprising the Government of the irregularities committed, and to the non-adherence to the provisions of the Mysore Municipalities Act, 1964 while granting the continuance of the lease and if so, the action on it;

(*e*) whether the Government is aware that by leasing out the lodgings in such a manner, the Municipality stands to loose a huge amount of Rs. 14,000 to Rs. 20,000 every year;

(*f*) whether the Government has any proposal to institute enquiry into the matter forthwith and to set things right and to take suitable action against the persons responsible for this irregularity?

SRI B. M. PATIL Mnister of State for Municipal Administrion:—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(c) Under Section 72 (2) of the Mysore Municipalities Act 1964 read with Notification No. PLM 28 MLR (1) 65, dated 17th January 1966.

(*d*) Yes. After detailed examination of the case, it is found that the orders of the Divisional Commissioner are in order and no action is called for.

(*e*) No.

(*f*) Does not arise in view of reply to clause (*d*)

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ:—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಹಂಪನ ಕಟ್ಟೆಯ ಪುರಸಭಾ ಬಸ್ಸು ನಿಲ್ದಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪುರಸಭೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ವಸತಿ ಕೋಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ೫ ವರ್ಷದ ಲೀಜ್ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಉಲ್ಲಂಘನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಲೀಜಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೆ?

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ :—ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಭಾಸ್ಕರಶೆಟ್ಟಿ:— ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೆ ಅವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್‌ನವರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಲಂಚ ಪಡೆದು ಆ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ಲೀಜಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್:—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಡಿವಿಜನಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ರೆಕಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT: - Without taking the Sanction of the Municipal Council, the Commissioner himself recommended to the Divisional Commissioner. Then, why should we have the Municipal Council.

SRI B. M. PATIL:—When the Municipal Council is functioning, the matter will go before it and when it is not functioning he is the appropriat authority of the Council who has to recommend the case to the higherauthority.

SRI N. G. HALAPPA:—Is it in consonance with the provisions of the Act.

SRI B. M. PATIL:—Yes.

## NEW MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING AT CHICKNAYAKANAHALLI TOWN

381. SRI C. K. RAJAIAH SHETTY (Chicknayakanahalli):—Will the Minister of State for Municipal Administration be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the cost of new Municipal Office building proposed to be constructed in Chicknaikanahalli Town;

(*b*) when technical and administrative sanction were accorded to these buildings;